arXiv:1410.8593v2 [hep-th] 16 Mar 2015

Chern-Simons Splitting of 2+1D Pure Yang-Mills Theory at Large Distances

T. Yildirim[a,b*]

[a]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242*

[b]*Department of Physics, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287*

March 17, 2015

Abstract

Holomorphic quantization of 2+1 dimensional pure Yang-Mills theory is studied with focusing on finite large scales. Previously we have shown that (Yildirim, 2015, Int. J. Mod. Phys A, 30(7), 1550034) topologically massive Yang-Mills theory exhibits a Chern-Simons splitting behavior at large scales, similar to the topologically massive AdS gravity model in its near Chern-Simons limit. This splitting occurs as a sum of two Chern-Simons terms with levels $k/2$ each. In the pure Chern-Simons limit, the split parts add up to give the original Chern-Simons term in the action. The opposite limit of the gravitational analogue is an Einstein-Hilbert term with a negative cosmological constant, which can be written as subtracted two half Chern-Simons terms. With this motivation, the gauge theory version of this limit is investigated, showing that at large distances, pure Yang-Mills theory acts like a topological theory that consists of split Chern-Simons parts with levels $k/2$ and $-k/2$. At very large distances these split terms cancel, making the Yang-Mills theory trivial as expected due to existence of a mass gap. Gauge invariance of the split parts is discussed. It is also shown that, this splitting behavior can be exploited to incorporate link invariants of knot theory, just like in the topologically massive case.

1 Introduction

It is known that topologically massive AdS gravity action can be written as two Chern-Simons(CS) terms [1–3]. For a dynamical metric $\gamma_{\mu\nu}$, the action is

$$S = \int d^3x \left[-\sqrt{-\gamma}(R - 2\Lambda) + \frac{1}{2\mu}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\left(\Gamma^{\alpha}_{\mu\beta}\partial_\nu\Gamma^{\beta}_{\rho\alpha} + \frac{2}{3}\Gamma^{\alpha}_{\mu\gamma}\Gamma^{\gamma}_{\nu\beta}\Gamma^{\beta}_{\rho\alpha}\right)\right]. \tag{1.1}$$

With using

$$A^{\pm}{}_{\mu}{}^{a}{}_{b}[e] = \omega_{\mu}{}^{a}{}_{b}[e] \pm \epsilon^{a}{}_{bc}e_{\mu}{}^{c}, \tag{1.2}$$

*tuna.yildirim@asu.edu

where $e_\mu{}^a$ is the dreibein and $\omega_\mu{}^a{}_b[e]$ is the torsion-free spin connection, it can be shown that the action (1.1) splits into two CS parts as

$$S[e] = -\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{\mu}\right) S_{CS}\big[A^+[e]\big] + \frac{1}{2}\left(1+\frac{1}{\mu}\right) S_{CS}\big[A^-[e]\big] \tag{1.3}$$

where

$$S_{CS}[A] = \frac{1}{2}\int \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\left(A_\mu{}^a{}_b\partial_\nu A_\rho{}^b{}_a + \frac{2}{3}A_\mu{}^a{}_c A_\nu{}^c{}_b A_\rho{}^b{}_a\right). \tag{1.4}$$

In the near CS limit, which is given by small values of μ, the action becomes a sum of two half CS terms as

$$S[e] \approx \frac{1}{2\mu} S_{CS}\big[A^+[e]\big] + \frac{1}{2\mu} S_{CS}\big[A^-[e]\big]. \tag{1.5}$$

This is analogous to what we have observed in ref. 4 for topologically massive Yang-Mills(TMYM) theory at large distances. We have shown that the inner product for vacuum states of TMYM theory can be written as

$$\langle\psi_0|\psi_0\rangle_{TMYM_k} = \langle\psi|\psi\rangle_{CS_{k/2}}\langle\psi|\psi\rangle_{CS_{k/2}} + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2), \tag{1.6}$$

where m is the topological mass, labels k and $k/2$ indicate the level of the CS term in the Lagrangian. It can be seen from (1.6) that the splitting occurs at large distances compared to $1/m$, by keeping the first order and neglecting all higher order terms in the $1/m$ expansion. An approximation like this is not necessary for the gravitational analogue in order to obtain a topological theory; it is already topological irrespective of the value of μ.

The mathematical origin of the CS splitting of TMYM theory lies in the phase space geometry. For pure CS theory, the symplectic two-form is given by $\Omega = \frac{ik}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \delta A^a_{\bar{z}}\delta A^a_z$, where Σ is a two dimensional surface. With coordinates $B_z = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{A}_1 + iA_2)$ and $C_z = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 + i\tilde{A}_2)$, where $\tilde{A}_\mu = A_\mu + \frac{1}{2m}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta}$, the symplectic two-form of TMYM theory can be written as

$$\Omega = \frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_\Sigma (\delta B^a_{\bar{z}}\delta B^a_z + \delta C^a_{\bar{z}}\delta C^a_z). \tag{1.7}$$

Both B_i and C_i transform like gauge fields and this allows one to interpret (1.7) as a phase space that consists of two CS phase spaces, both with level number $k/2$. Pure CS limit is given by $m \to \infty$ or equivalently $B_i = C_i$.

Although $\langle\psi_0|\psi_0\rangle_{TMYM_k}$ is gauge invariant in its own right for any integer value of k, it seems that gauge invariance is broken on the right hand side(1.6). This is not true, since both half-CS terms separately bring an extra $\pi k\omega$ term as they transform, where ω is the winding number. They add up to $2\pi k\omega$, which does not change the value of the path integral. This transformation can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(B) + \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(C) \to \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(B) + \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(C) + 2\pi k\omega. \tag{1.8}$$

Here, both CS terms bring the same winding number because both CS gauge fields transform together with the same gauge group element. If separate gauge invariance of the split CS halves is required for any reason, such as writing TMYM observables in terms of CS observables, then k must be forced to take only even values.

In the pure Einstein-Hilbert limit $\mu \to \infty$ of topologically massive AdS gravity model, the action (1.1) becomes

$$S[e] = \frac{1}{2} S_{CS}\big[A^-[e]\big] - \frac{1}{2} S_{CS}\big[A^+[e]\big]. \tag{1.9}$$

The gauge theory analogue of this limit is a pure Yang-Mills(YM) theory. This provides good motivation to study pure YM theory at large distances, to see whether or not the analogy can be extended to this limit and a similar CS splitting with levels $k/2$ and $-k/2$ can be observed. This is the main goal of this paper.

2 Yang-Mills Theory In 2+1 Dimensions

The YM action is given by

$$S_{YM} = -\frac{k}{4\pi}\frac{1}{4m} \int\limits_{\Sigma\times[t_i,t_f]} d^3x \; Tr\; (F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}). \tag{2.1}$$

where Σ is an orientable two dimensional surface and m is in mass dimensions. $A_\mu = -iA^a_\mu t^a$ where t^a are matrix representatives of the Lie algebra $[t^a, t^b] = if^{abc}t^c$ and in the fundamental representation they are normalized as $Tr(t^a t^b) = \frac{1}{2}\delta^{ab}$. The arbitrary constant $\frac{k}{4\pi}$ is dimensionless and inserted for future convenience. The equations of motion are given by $D_\nu F^{\mu\nu} = 0$, where $D_\mu \bullet = \partial_\mu \bullet + [A_\mu, \bullet]$.

In the temporal gauge $A_0 = 0$ with complex coordinates $A_z = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 + iA_2)$ and $A_{\bar z} = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 - iA_2)$, the conjugate momenta are given by

$$\Pi^{az} = \frac{k}{8\pi m} F^{a0z} \;\text{ and }\; \Pi^{a\bar z} = \frac{k}{8\pi m} F^{a0\bar z}. \tag{2.2}$$

With $E_z = \frac{i}{2m}F^{0\bar z}$ and $E_{\bar z} = -\frac{i}{2m}F^{0z}$, the momenta can be rewritten as

$$\Pi^{az} = \frac{ik}{4\pi} E^a_{\bar z} \;\text{ and }\; \Pi^{a\bar z} = -\frac{ik}{4\pi} E^a_z. \tag{2.3}$$

With these coordinates, the symplectic two form is given by

$$\Omega = \frac{ik}{4\pi} \int\limits_\Sigma (\delta E^a_{\bar z} \delta A^a_z + \delta A^a_{\bar z} \delta E^a_z). \tag{2.4}$$

The generator of infinitesimal gauge transformations is $G^a = \frac{ik}{4\pi}(D_z E_{\bar z} - D_{\bar z} E_z)^a$. Then the Gauss' law is given by $G^a = 0$, which is also one of the equations of motion.

To show how CS splitting happens, we want to write Ω in two *CS-like* parts. Here, the term "*CS-like*" means that the symplectic two-form is written in terms of fields that transform like non-abelian gauge fields. To do this, we introduce new coordinates

$$\tilde{A}_\mu = A_\mu + \frac{1}{2m}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta} \text{ and } \hat{A}_\mu = A_\mu - \frac{1}{2m}\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta} \tag{2.5}$$

or equally

$$\tilde{A}_i = A_i + E_i \text{ and } \hat{A}_i = A_i - E_i. \tag{2.6}$$

Since E_i is gauge covariant, $\tilde{A}_i$ and $\hat{A}_i$ transform like gauge fields. Now, Ω can be written only in terms of gauge fields as

$$\Omega = \frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_\Sigma (\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}\delta A^a_z - \delta A^a_{\bar{z}}\delta\hat{A}^a_z). \tag{2.7}$$

The phase space is Kähler with the potential

$$K = \frac{k}{4\pi}\int_\Sigma (\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}A^a_z - A^a_{\bar{z}}\hat{A}^a_z). \tag{2.8}$$

Using $\tilde{A}_i$ and $\hat{A}_i$ as connections, new covariant derivatives $\tilde{D}_i$ and $\hat{D}_i$ can be defined that are going to be useful later.

Chern-Simons splitting of the phase space is more evident with the following coordinates: $B_z = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{A}_1 + iA_2)$ and $C_z = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 + i\hat{A}_2)$. Now, the symplectic two-form can be written as

$$\Omega = \frac{ik}{4\pi}\int_\Sigma (\delta B^a_{\bar{z}}\delta B^a_z - \delta C^a_{\bar{z}}\delta C^a_z). \tag{2.9}$$

Both B_i and C_i transform like non-abelian gauge fields. The symplectic two form of CS theory is given by $\Omega = \frac{ik}{2\pi}\int_\Sigma \delta A^a_{\bar{z}}\delta A^a_z$. Then, it can be seen that (2.9) consists of two CS phase spaces with levels $k/2$ and $-k/2$. In the $m \to \infty$ limit, $B = C$ and this cancellation leads to a trivial phase space.

2.1 Parametrization of Gauge Fields

When Σ is simply connected, we can define a new field $\mathcal{A}_i$ such that it satisfies [5]

$$\partial_z A_{\bar{z}} - \partial_{\bar{z}}\mathcal{A}_z + [\mathcal{A}_z, A_{\bar{z}}] = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

With this flatness condition, we can define an $SL(N,\mathbb{C})$ matrix U as

$$U(x,0,C) = \mathcal{P}\ exp\left(-\int_{C}^{x}(A_{\bar{z}}d\bar{z} + \mathcal{A}_z dz)\right). \tag{2.11}$$

The flatness condition (2.10) makes U invariant under small deformations of the path C. U gauge transforms as $U^g = gU$, where $g \in SU(N)$. From (2.11), it follows that

$$A_{\bar{z}} = -\partial_{\bar{z}} U U^{-1} \text{ and } A_z = U^{\dagger-1}\partial_z U^\dagger \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}_z = -\partial_z U U^{-1} \text{ and } \mathcal{A}_{\bar{z}} = U^{\dagger-1}\partial_{\bar{z}} U^\dagger. \tag{2.13}$$

Since $\tilde{A}_i$ and $\hat{A}_i$ transform like gauge fields, they can be parametrized like one. Using new $SL(N,\mathbb{C})$ matrices $\tilde{U}$ and $\hat{U}$ that are defined similar to (2.11), we can parametrize the tilde and hat fields as

$$\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}} = -\partial_{\bar{z}} \tilde{U} \tilde{U}^{-1} \text{ and } \tilde{A}_z = \tilde{U}^{\dagger-1}\partial_z \tilde{U}^\dagger, \tag{2.14}$$

and

$$\hat{A}_{\bar{z}} = -\partial_{\bar{z}} \hat{U} \hat{U}^{-1} \text{ and } \hat{A}_z = \hat{U}^{\dagger-1}\partial_z \hat{U}^\dagger. \tag{2.15}$$

Also, $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ can be written similar to (2.13). We can use (2.5) to relate the matrices $\tilde{U}$ and $\hat{U}$ with U. Assuming solutions of the form $\tilde{U} = UM$ and $\hat{U} = UN$, (2.5) can be solved with

$$M(z,\bar{z}) = N^{-1}(z,\bar{z}) = \mathcal{P}\, exp\left(\frac{i}{2m}\int_0^{\bar{z}} \mathcal{F}^{0w} d\bar{w}\right), \tag{2.16}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{0z} = U^{-1}F^{0z}U$. It can be seen that $\mathcal{F}$ is gauge invariant, which makes M and N gauge invariant. With these new matrices, the E-field components can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} E_z =& U^{\dagger-1}M^{\dagger-1}\partial_z M^\dagger U^\dagger = -U^{\dagger-1}N^{\dagger-1}\partial_z N^\dagger U^\dagger \\ E_{\bar{z}} =& -U\partial_{\bar{z}} M M^{-1}U^{-1} = U\partial_{\bar{z}} N N^{-1}U^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

We can also write the $\mathcal{E}$-fields that are given by $\mathcal{E}_i = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i - \mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_i - \hat{\mathcal{A}}_i$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_z =& -U\partial_z M M^{-1}U^{-1} = U\partial_z N N^{-1}U^{-1} \\ \mathcal{E}_{\bar{z}} =& U^{\dagger-1}M^{\dagger-1}\partial_{\bar{z}} M^\dagger U^\dagger = -U^{\dagger-1}N^{\dagger-1}\partial_{\bar{z}} N^\dagger U^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

2.2 The Wave-Functional

At least for the gauge theories that we are interested in, such as CS, YM or TMYM, the wave-functional can be factorized as $\psi = \phi\chi$. Here, ϕ is the part that satisfies the Gauss's law constraint $G^a\psi = 0$ and χ is the gauge invariant part that is necessary for ψ to satisfy the Schrödinger's equation $\mathcal{H}\psi = \mathcal{E}\psi$. To find ϕ, the standard technique is to make an infinitesimal gauge transformation on ψ, then force the Gauss' law to obtain a condition that is solved by the Wess-Zumino-Witten(WZW) action. Once ϕ is known, then Schrödinger's equation can be tackled to find χ.

At this point a polarization needs to be chosen. Choosing the holomorphic polarization gives $\Phi[A_z, A_{\bar{z}}, \hat{A}_z, \tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}] = e^{-\frac{1}{2}K}\psi[A_{\bar{z}}, \tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}]$, where K is the Kähler potential given by (2.8), Φ and ψ are the pre-quantum and quantum wave-functionals.

From (2.7), upon quantization we can write

$$A^a_z\psi = \frac{4\pi}{k}\frac{\delta\psi}{\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}} \text{ and } \hat{A}^a_z\psi = -\frac{4\pi}{k}\frac{\delta\psi}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}}. \tag{2.19}$$

Now, we make an infinitesimal gauge transformation on ψ,

$$\delta_\epsilon\psi[A_{\bar{z}},\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}] = \int d^2z\ \left(\delta_\epsilon A^a_{\bar{z}}\frac{\delta\psi}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}} + \ \delta_\epsilon\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}\frac{\delta\psi}{\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}}\right). \tag{2.20}$$

Using (2.19), $\delta A^a_{\bar{z}} = D_{\bar{z}}\epsilon^a$ and $\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}} = \tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}\epsilon^a$, (2.20) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\epsilon\psi =& \int d^2z\ \epsilon^a\left(D_{\bar{z}}\frac{\delta}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}} + \tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}\frac{\delta}{\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}}\right)\psi \\ =& \frac{k}{4\pi}\int d^2z\ \epsilon^a\left(\tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}A^a_z - D_{\bar{z}}\hat{A}^a_z\right)\psi.\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Using (2.5), (2.21) becomes

$$\delta_\epsilon\psi = \frac{k}{4\pi}\int d^2z\epsilon^a\left(\partial_z E^a_{\bar{z}} - D_z E^a_{\bar{z}} + D_{\bar{z}}E^a_z\right)\psi. \tag{2.22}$$

Applying the Gauss' law $G^a\psi = 0$ makes the last two terms cancel, leaving

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\epsilon\psi =& \frac{k}{4\pi}\int d^2z\ \epsilon^a\left(\partial_z E^a_{\bar{z}}\right)\psi \\ =& \frac{k}{4\pi}\int d^2z\ \epsilon^a\left(\partial_z\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}} - \partial_z A^a_{\bar{z}}\right)\psi \\ =& \frac{k}{4\pi}\int d^2z\ \epsilon^a\left(\partial_z A^a_{\bar{z}} - \partial_z\hat{A}^a_{\bar{z}}\right)\psi.\end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

This condition is solved by $\psi = \phi\chi$ with

$$\phi[A_{\bar{z}},\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}] = exp\left[\frac{k}{2}\big(S_{WZW}(\tilde{U}) - S_{WZW}(U)\big)\right], \tag{2.24}$$

or equally

$$\phi[A_{\bar{z}},\hat{A}_{\bar{z}}] = exp\left[\frac{k}{2}\big(S_{WZW}(U) - S_{WZW}(\hat{U})\big)\right]. \tag{2.25}$$

The equivalence of (2.24) and (2.25) can be shown by using the Polyakov-Wiegmann(PW) identity [6, 7] with $\tilde{U} = UM$ and $\hat{U} = UM^{-1}$.

Holomorphic components of gauge fields acting on ϕ gives $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ fields, as

$$A^a_z\phi = \frac{4\pi}{k}\frac{\delta\phi}{\delta\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^a_z\phi \text{ and } \hat{A}^a_z\phi = -\frac{4\pi}{k}\frac{\delta\phi}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}} = \mathcal{A}^a_z\phi. \tag{2.26}$$

2.3 The Schrödinger's Equation

YM Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = T + V \text{ with } T = \frac{m}{\alpha} E^a_{\bar{z}} E^a_z \text{ and } V = \frac{\alpha}{m} B^a B^a, \tag{2.27}$$

where $\alpha = \frac{4\pi}{k}$, $B = \frac{ik}{2\pi} F^{z\bar{z}}$. We are interested in finding the vacuum wave-functional, which is given by $\mathcal{H}\psi_0 = 0$, or with using Euclidean metric,

$$E^a_{\bar{z}} E^a_z \psi_0 + \frac{1}{64m^2} F^a_{z\bar{z}} F^a_{z\bar{z}} \psi_0 = 0. \tag{2.28}$$

For both YM and TMYM theories, χ is typically in the form[1] of $e^{-\frac{1}{m^2}\int F^2}$ [4, 8, 9], since they have the same Hamiltonian in the temporal gauge. Since this decay behavior originates from the existence of a mass gap, it cannot be polarization dependent and we expect it to be valid here as well. To check this assumption we will first focus on the potential energy term. Using (2.26), the B-field acting on ψ is

$$\begin{aligned} F^a_{z\bar{z}}\psi =& (\partial_z A^a_{\bar{z}} - D_{\bar{z}} A^a_z)\psi \\ =& D_{\bar{z}}(\mathcal{A}^a_z - A^a_z)\psi \\ =& D_{\bar{z}} \left(-\mathcal{E}^a_z \psi - \frac{4\pi}{k} \frac{\delta \chi}{\delta \tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}} \phi \right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_z$ is given by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_z - \mathcal{A}_z$. If we consider only the potential energy term, χ is given by

$$\chi = exp\left(-\frac{k}{4\pi} \int_\Sigma E^a_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{E}^a_z \right) = exp\left(-\frac{k}{4\pi} \int_\Sigma (\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}} - A^a_{\bar{z}}) \mathcal{E}^a_z \right) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2). \tag{2.30}$$

To study the kinetic energy term, $E_z\psi$ needs to be calculated. Using (2.26), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} E^a_z \psi =& (A^a_z - \hat{A}^a_z)\phi\chi \\ =& \mathcal{E}^a_z \psi + \frac{4\pi}{k} \phi \left(\frac{\delta \chi}{\delta \tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}} + \frac{\delta \chi}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

χ is a function of both $A_{\bar{z}}$ and $\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}$ and it is gauge invariant by definition. The only way to ensure gauge invariance with these variables is to have $\chi[\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}, A^a_{\bar{z}}] = \chi[\tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}} - A^a_{\bar{z}}] = \chi[E^a_{\bar{z}}]$, which can be seen clearly in (2.30). We can then write

$$\frac{\delta \chi}{\delta \tilde{A}^a_{\bar{z}}} = -\frac{\delta \chi}{\delta A^a_{\bar{z}}} = \frac{\delta \chi}{\delta E^a_{\bar{z}}}. \tag{2.32}$$

This leads to

$$E^a_{\bar{z}} E^a_z \psi = E^a_{\bar{z}} \mathcal{E}^a_z \psi. \tag{2.33}$$

[1] Except for very short distances.

Thus, as far as only the kinetic energy term is concerned, a constant χ is sufficient [8]. If we neglect the potential energy term, the vacuum condition forces $\mathcal{E}^a_z$ to be zero. This means that at large distances, the matrix M has to be a holomorphic function of $\bar{z}$. It can be seen from (2.30) that, $\mathcal{E}^a_z = 0$ is consistent with neglecting the B-field contribution.

Our goal is to study the large distance behavior of the theory by neglecting second and higher order terms in $1/m$. Neglecting the potential energy term is standard practice in these type of cases. The reasoning is as follows. Since the energy is low, charges move very slowly and do not create significant magnetic fields [10]. When the potential term is not neglected, we expect the full solution for (2.28) to be an interpolation between the kinetic energy eigenstate and potential energy eigenstate. Since neither of these states has a first order term in $1/m$, even if we do not neglect the potential term, there should not be any first order contribution. This result is consistent with ref. 8. Thus, for the scale that we focus on, $\chi = 1$ can be taken safely[2], just like in TMYM theory [4].

2.4 The Measure

From (2.8), we can write the metric of the space of gauge fields $\mathscr{A}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{\mathscr{A}} &= -4\int Tr(\delta\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}\delta A_z - \delta A_{\bar{z}}\delta\hat{A}_z) \\ &= 4\int Tr[\tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}(\delta\tilde{U}\tilde{U}^{-1})D_z(U^{\dagger-1}\delta U^\dagger) - D_{\bar{z}}(\delta U U^{-1})\hat{D}_z(\hat{U}^{\dagger-1}\delta\hat{U}^\dagger)]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Similar to the analysis in refs. 11 and 4, the gauge invariant measure is given by

$$d\mu(\mathscr{A}) = det(\tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}D_z)det(D_{\bar{z}}\hat{D}_z)d\mu(\hat{U}^\dagger U)d\mu(U^\dagger\tilde{U}). \tag{2.35}$$

For a certain choice of local counter terms ($\int Tr(\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}}A_z + \hat{A}_z A_{\bar{z}})$),

$$det(\tilde{D}_{\bar{z}}D_z)det(D_{\bar{z}}\hat{D}_z) = const.\times e^{2c_A\left(S_{WZW}(U^\dagger\tilde{U})+S_{WZW}(\hat{U}^\dagger U)\right)}, \tag{2.36}$$

where c_A is the quadratic Casimir in the adjoint representation given by $c_A\delta^{ab} = f^{amn}f^{bmn}$. To simplify the notation, we will continue with $H_1 = U^\dagger\tilde{U}$ and $H_2 = \hat{U}^\dagger U$. These two matrices are $SU(N)$ gauge invariant and belong to the coset $SL(N,\mathbb{C})/SU(N)$. Now, the gauge invariant measure can be written as

$$d\mu(\mathscr{A}) = e^{2c_A\left(S_{WZW}(H_1)+S_{WZW}(H_2)\right)}d\mu(H_1)d\mu(H_2). \tag{2.37}$$

2.5 Chern-Simons Splitting

For holomorphic polarization, the inner product is given by

$$\langle\psi|\psi\rangle = \int d\mu(\mathcal{M})\, e^{-K}\,\psi^*\psi, \tag{2.38}$$

[2] At least when the potential energy is neglected, in case the interpolation argument is wrong.

where K is the Kähler potential, $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth even dimensional manifold and $d\mu(\mathcal{M})$ is the Liouville measure on the phase space, given by Ω [5]. Using (2.8), (2.24) and (2.25) with PW identity gives

$$e^{-K}\ \psi^*\psi = e^{\frac{k}{2}\left(S_{WZW}(H_1)-S_{WZW}(H_2)\right)}\chi^*\chi. \tag{2.39}$$

As we have seen in subsection 2.3,

$$\chi^*\chi = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2). \tag{2.40}$$

Now, using (2.37), (2.39) and (2.40), we can write the inner product for the vacuum state as

$$\langle\psi_0|\psi_0\rangle = \int d\mu(H_1)d\mu(H_2)e^{\left(2c_A+\frac{k}{2}\right)S_{WZW}(H_1)+\left(2c_A-\frac{k}{2}\right)S_{WZW}(H_2)} + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2). \tag{2.41}$$

The inner product for CS theory is given by [12]

$$\langle\psi|\psi\rangle_{CS} = \int d\mu(H)e^{(2c_A+k)S_{WZW}(H)}, \tag{2.42}$$

where $H = U^\dagger U$. It can be seen that the YM inner product (2.41) consists of two WZW terms with levels $k/2$ and $-k/2$ that cancel as $m \to \infty$, since $H_1 = H_2 = H$ in this limit. With (2.42), YM inner product can be written as

$$\langle\psi_0|\psi_0\rangle_{YM_k} = \langle\psi|\psi\rangle_{CS_{k/2}}\langle\psi|\psi\rangle_{CS_{-k/2}} + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2). \tag{2.43}$$

It appears that YM inner product splits into two CS terms at large distances, just as we predicted by studying its gravitational analogue (1.9).

The gauge invariance issue of the right hand side of (2.43) is solved similar to our analysis of TMYM. Under a gauge transformation, two split CS terms bring $\pi k\omega$ and $-\pi k\omega$ as

$$\frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(B) + \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(C) \to \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(B) + \frac{1}{2}S_{CS}(C) + \pi k\omega - \pi k\omega, \tag{2.44}$$

which leads to gauge invariance. But writing YM observables at large scales in terms of CS observables can only be done for even values of k.

3 Wilson Loops

In our analysis of TMYM theory [4], we used CS splitting to incorporate knot theory. A similar calculation can be done here, for pure YM theory at large distances.

In the temporal gauge, the Wilson loop operator is

$$W_R(C) = Tr_R\ \mathcal{P}\ e^{-\oint_c (A_z dz + A_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z})}. \tag{3.1}$$

Expanding the path ordered exponential for $W_R(C)\psi$ is complicated, since A_z is a derivative operator. This problem is solved in ref. 4 by replacing A_z with $\mathcal{A}_z$ to define a Wilson loop-like observable $\mathcal{W}_R(C)$ as

$$\mathcal{W}_R(C) = Tr_R\, \mathcal{P}\, e^{-\oint_c (\mathcal{A}_z dz + A_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z})} = Tr_R\, U(x,x,C). \tag{3.2}$$

This replacement makes the operator invariant under small deformations of the path C on Σ. However, it does not prevent doing deformations in the time direction to obtain skein relations. For pure CS theory, once the Gauss' law constraint is applied, A_z becomes equal to $\mathcal{A}_z$. Thus, the $A_z \to \mathcal{A}_z$ replacement procedure gives the Wilson loop a CS-like behavior irrespective of the Lagrangian.

Using $\tilde{A}$, we can define a dual operator

$$\mathcal{T}_R(C) = Tr_R\, \mathcal{P}\, e^{-\oint_c (\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_z dz + \tilde{A}_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z})} = Tr_R\, \tilde{U}(x,x,C). \tag{3.3}$$

After the derivative operators are replaced with $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, the new loop operators $\mathcal{W}_R(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_R(C_2)$ commute with each other, as well as with $\psi[U,\tilde{U}]$. Here, C_1 and C_2 are non-intersecting closed curves.

Since $\mathcal{W}_R(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_R(C_2)$ are gauge invariant and the theory is given by the WZW action, these loop operators can be written in terms of gauge invariant WZW currents via the following $SL(N,\mathbb{C})$ gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{\bar{z}} &= \hat{U}^{\dagger -1}(-\partial_{\bar{z}} H_2 H_2^{-1})\hat{U}^\dagger - \partial_{\bar{z}}\hat{U}^{\dagger -1}\hat{U}^\dagger, \\
\mathcal{A}_z &= \hat{U}^{\dagger -1}(-\partial_z H_2 H_2^{-1})\hat{U}^\dagger - \partial_z \hat{U}^{\dagger -1}\hat{U}^\dagger, \\
\tilde{A}_{\bar{z}} &= U^{\dagger -1}(-\partial_{\bar{z}} H_1 H_1^{-1})U^\dagger - \partial_{\bar{z}} U^{\dagger -1}U^\dagger, \\
\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_z &= U^{\dagger -1}(-\partial_z H_1 H_1^{-1})U^\dagger - \partial_z U^{\dagger -1}U^\dagger.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

With using (3.4), $\mathcal{W}_R(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_R(C_2)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_R(C_1,H_2) &= Tr_R\, \mathcal{P}\, exp \oint_{C_1} (\partial_z H_2 H_2^{-1} dz + \partial_{\bar{z}} H_2 H_2^{-1} d\bar{z}), \\
\mathcal{T}_R(C_2,H_1) &= Tr_R\, \mathcal{P}\, exp \oint_{C_2} (\partial_z H_1 H_1^{-1} dz + \partial_{\bar{z}} H_1 H_1^{-1} d\bar{z}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The expectation value of the product of these two observables is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{W}_{R_1}(C_1)\mathcal{T}_{R_2}(C_2)\rangle &= \int d\mu(\mathscr{A})\psi_0^* \mathcal{W}_{R_1}(C_1)\mathcal{T}_{R_2}(C_2)\psi_0 \\
&= \int d\mu(H_1)d\mu(H_2) e^{\left(2c_A+\frac{k}{2}\right)S_{WZW}(H_1)+\left(2c_A-\frac{k}{2}\right)S_{WZW}(H_2)} \\
&\quad \times \mathcal{W}_{R_1}(C_1,H_2)\mathcal{T}_{R_2}(C_2,H_1) + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

For even level numbers, (3.6) can be written in terms of CS Wilson loop expectation values as

$$\langle \mathcal{W}_{R_1}(C_1)\mathcal{T}_{R_2}(C_2)\rangle_{TMYM_{2k}} = \Big(\langle \mathcal{W}_{R_1}(C_1)\rangle_{CS_k}\Big)\Big(\langle \mathcal{W}_{R_2}(C_2)\rangle_{CS_{-k}}\Big) + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2). \tag{3.7}$$

In the fundamental representation, the right-hand side of (3.7) is given by the HOMFLY polynomial [13,14]. Thus, the left-hand side is indirectly given by skein relations, therefore it is a link invariant.

4 Conclusion

We have shown that three dimensional pure YM theory acts like a topological theory at certain limited scales. When the distance is large enough but finite, YM theory splits into two CS terms with levels $k/2$ and $-k/2$, very similar to the splitting of topologically massive AdS gravity model. At very large distances, these two CS terms cancel to make YM theory trivial, as required by the existence of a mass gap. Together with our previous work on TMYM theory [4], we have shown that both YM and TMYM theories exhibit CS splitting at large scales, just as predicted by their gravitational analogues. For both YM and TMYM theories, this limited topological region can be exploited to incorporate link invariants of knot theory.

Acknowledgements

I am thankful to Vincent Rodgers and Parameswaran Nair for their supervision and support. I also thank the Beyond Center for Fundamental Concepts in Science at Arizona State University for their hospitality. This work was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant NSF1067889.

References

[1] E. Witten. 2+ 1 Dimensional Gravity As An Exactly Soluble System. *Nuclear Physics B*, 311(1):46–78, 1988.

[2] S. Carlip, S. Deser, A. Waldron, and D.K. Wise. Topologically Massive AdS Gravity. *Physics Letters B*, 666(3):272 – 276, 2008.

[3] S. Carlip, S. Deser, A. Waldron, and D.K. Wise. Cosmological Topologically Massive Gravitons and Photons. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 26(7):075008, 2009.

[4] T. Yildirim. Topologically Massive Yang-Mills Theory and Link Invariants. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 30(7):1550034, 2015.

[5] V.P. Nair. *Quantum Field Theory: A Modern Perspective*. Springer, 2005.

[6] A. Polyakov and P.B. Wiegmann. Theory of Nonabelian Goldstone Bosons In Two Dimensions. *Physics Letters B*, 131:121 – 126, 1983.

[7] A.M. Polyakov and P.B. Wiegmann. Goldstone Fields In Two Dimensions With Multivalued actions. *Physics Letters B*, 141:223 – 228, 1984.

[8] D. Karabali, C.-J. Kim, and V.P. Nair. On the Vacuum Wave Function and String Tension of Yang-Mills Theories In (2+1)-Dimensions. *Physics Letters B*, B434:103–109, 1998.

[9] D. Karabali, C.-J. Kim, and V.P. Nair. Gauge Invariant Variables and the Yang-Mills-Chern-Simons Theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, B566:331–347, 2000.

[10] G. Grignani, G. Semenoff, P. Sodano, and O. Tirkkonen. G/G Models as the Strong Coupling Limit of Topologically Massive Gauge Theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 489:360 – 384, 1997.

[11] D. Karabali and V.P. Nair. Gauge Invariance and Mass Gap in (2+1)-Dimensional Yang-Mills Theory. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, A12:1161–1172, 1997.

[12] M. Bos and V.P. Nair. Coherent State Quantization of Chern-Simons Theory. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, A5:959, 1990.

[13] P. Freyd, D. Yetter, J. Hoste, W.B.R. Lickorish, K. Millett, and A. Ocneanu. A New Polynomial Invariant of Knots and Links. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 12(2):239–246, 1985.

[14] E. Witten. Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 121:351, 1989.